

# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE		ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/721,279	10/721,279 11/26/2003		Chien-An Chen	4413-0130P	5462	
2292	7590	EXAM	EXAMINER			
BIRCH ST PO BOX 74		KOLASCH & BIR	PRASAD, CHANDRIKA			
	•	A 22040-0747	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
				2839		

DATE MAILED: 11/17/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

					W			
		Application No	·	Applicant(s)				
		10/721,279		CHEN ET AL.				
Office Action Summary		Examiner		Art Unit				
		Chandrika Pras		2839				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication a or Reply	ppears on the cove	er sheet with the	correspondence addre	ss			
THE - Exte after - If the - If NO - Failt Any	MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION ensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR of SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. The period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a result of the provision of th	1.  1.136(a). In no event, how  ply within the statutory m  d will apply and will expire  ute, cause the application	vever, may a reply be tii inimum of thirty (30) day e SIX (6) MONTHS from to become ABANDONE	mely filed ys will be considered timely. In the mailing date of this comm ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	unication.			
Status								
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26	November 2003.						
	This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) This action is non-final.							
3)	· <del>=</del>							
	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Disposit	ion of Claims							
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) <u>1-6</u> is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withded Claim(s) is/are allowed.  Claim(s) <u>1-6</u> is/are rejected.  Claim(s) is/are objected to.  Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	rawn from conside						
Applicat	tion Papers							
9) 又	The specification is objected to by the Exami	ner.						
• —	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) a		ojected to by the	Examiner.				
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the	ne drawing(s) be hel	d in abeyance. Sε	ee 37 CFR 1.85(a).				
11)	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction of the oath or declaration is objected to by the	•		-				
Priority	under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
12)□ a)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority docume 2. Certified copies of the priority docume 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority docume application from the International Bures See the attached detailed Office action for a li	ents have been rec ents have been rec riority documents h eau (PCT Rule 17.	eived. eived in Applicat nave been receiv 2(a)).	tion No red in this National Sta	age			
Attachmer	nt(s) ce of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) [	Interview Summary	v (PTO-413)				
2)	ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) rmation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/0 er No(s)/Mail Date	5) C 6) C	Paper No(s)/Mail D Notice of Informal I		52)			

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

### Specification

1. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.
- 3. Claims 1-2 and 4-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Chen (6796500).

Chen (Figures 1-5) shows a chargeable compact card reader having a USB connector 52; a charging circuit (not numbered) and a control chip (not numbered) on a printed circuit board 5 connected to the USB port; a slot 34 for connecting to a PDA or a personal computer; a memory card-connecting slot 440 for receiving one type or different types of a memory card 7; a switch 55 and a power slot 331. It is inherent that the slot 34 could be also used for connected a cellular phone.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Application/Control Number: 10/721,279 Page 3

Art Unit: 2839

5. Claim 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chen

(6796500).

Chen shows all the features of this claim as described above except a slot for connecting a battery. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the instant invention to provide another slot for connecting a battery because this would require a mere duplication of essential parts, which involve only routine skill in the art.

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's

disclosure. Herrod et al. (20010055978), Myers et al. (6102284), McGregor et al.

(20010000777), Sorek et al. (20010034803), Aisenbeg et al. (200401161550 and Jacobson

et al. (6486862).

**Contact Information** 

7. Any correspondence to this action may be mailed to:

St. Regis Co. vs. Bemis co., 193 USPQ 8.

Commissioner for Patents Post Office Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chandrika Prasad at (571) 272-2099. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor can be reached at (571) 272-2800 ext 39. The fax number is (703) 872-9306.

Chandrika Prasad Primary examiner November 10, 2004